

1 STEVEN J. IGNATZ

2 A. No, sir.

3 Q. Okay. Did Hile not mention that?

4 A. I had never even heard that name
5 until just now, sir.

6 Q. Okay. Now, we were on our form
7 looking at delays. The next entry is
8 2/24/06.

9 Correct?

10 It's the third page there?

11 A. Where?

12 MR. HENZES: Page three.

13 BY MR. PURICELLI:

14 Q. Right here.

15 MR. HENZES: Up top.

16 BY MR. PURICELLI:

17 Q. In the narrative.

18 A. Oh, okay. Yes, sir.

19 Q. Now, just above that there's a
20 block called for attachments.

21 Correct?

22 A. Yes.

23 Q. And none of them are checked off.
24 Not one.

25 Right?

2 A. They only check that on the front
3 page.

4 Q. Okay.

5 A. And the one that's checked is for
6 statement.

7 Q. Okay. That only means they only
8 took a statement.

9 Right?

10 A. Right.

11 On supplemental reports
12 they check it on that page and initial
13 incident reports it's on the front page.

14 Q. Okay. Now, in the narrative it
15 indicates on the top one that an organization
16 called Haven was contacted. Telephoned.

17 Right?

18 A. Yes.

19 Q. Okay.

20 A. I don't know if they were
21 telephoned or not.

22 Q. Fair enough.

23 And the only indication
24 from that is that the trooper asked them to
25 see if they could find Sara and the kids'

2 whereabouts.

3 Isn't that true?

4 A. He did request that. Yes.

5 Q. Now, is it also true that
6 available to a trooper assigned to locate
7 kids, okay, could access the motor vehicle
8 code or the motor vehicle -- PennDOT's
9 records to see whether or not there's been
10 change of addresses for driver's licenses?

11 A. Yes.

12 Q. He could do the same thing for
13 the titles and the registration of vehicles
14 to see if there's been a change of address.

15 Isn't that true?

16 A. Yes.

17 Q. And that's not indicated as
18 having been done here.

19 Is it?

20 A. I don't see that anywhere.

21 Q. Okay. That's fair. You just
22 don't see it. I couldn't see it, either.
23 Maybe I missed it; as Randy says is my
24 shortfallings?

25 MR. HENZES: You know, I

2 find this kind of fascinating, but
3 you're asking him what some other guy
4 did and it's on these two guys' dime,
5 but that's up to them. If they want to
6 spend their money by you asking him
7 about somebody else's report, that's
8 entirely up to you.

9 MR. PURICELLI: Yeah.
10 He's a lieutenant in the State Police.

11 MR. HENZES: Yeah, but
12 you're asking him what somebody else
13 did. You're asking him about a report
14 that's self-explanatory that really he
15 has nothing to do with.

16 Again, it's their money.
17 They want you to spend it that way,
18 that's fine.

19 MR. PURICELLI: That's
20 fine. That's okay, Randy.

21 You done?

22 BY MR. PURICELLI:

23 Q. Okay. Now, Randy said if I look
24 at the report I would see immediately what he
25 did.

2 Is it true looking at this
3 report from a lieutenant in a supervisory
4 form, having gone through all that stuff
5 about immediacy, okay, that within 24 hours
6 only thing he's done is make contact to one
7 source to see if that source can find
8 somebody?

9 Isn't that true?

10 A. He also contacted Trooper Smith.
11 I'm not sure when he did that exactly, but
12 that's also documented.

13 Q. We can't tell because the report
14 is not thorough.

15 Is it?

16 A. It doesn't have the date and time
17 that person was contacted.

18 Q. If it was a thorough report would
19 it have the date and time he does things?

20 A. I would like to think so.

21 Q. I know you would. I would like
22 you to give me an idea what you think based
23 on being a trained supervisor of the
24 Pennsylvania State Police and from that point
25 of view, not personally.

2 A. I understand.

3 Q. That's really why I'm asking
4 these questions.

5 So you're a supervisor.
6 You see this report come in. Its to be under
7 State Police requirements to be a thorough
8 report.

9 Right?

10 You should be able to tell
11 who, what, where, when and why.

12 Right?

13 A. Yes, sir.

14 Q. And we can't tell from the report
15 when Trooper Smith was contacted.

16 Can we?

17 A. No.

18 Q. So it could have been at any
19 time.

20 Couldn't it?

21 A. The report is dated March 1. So
22 it had to be between the 23rd and the 1st.

23 Q. How many days is that? Six days?

24 A. Six days.

25 Q. But we don't know.

1 STEVEN J. IGNATZ

2 Right?

3 A. Right.

4 Q. Now, the next entry is a report
5 indicated 10/4/06.

6 Correct?

7 The next page all the way
8 at the bottom.

9 A. Yes, sir.

10 Q. Uh-huh.

11 And that date --

12 A. No. That's his badge number.

13 Q. Oh, is it?

14 A. The date of the report is right
15 here (indicating).

16 Q. Oh, 3/18/08. Fair enough.

17 Okay. And that indicates
18 activities on the 6th and the 11th of March.

19 Doesn't it?

20 A. Yes.

21 Q. So another week at the very least
22 has passed from the activity date to the
23 report date.

24 Correct?

25 A. Yes.

2 Q. All right. So these entries
3 aren't necessarily done contemporaneous to
4 the actions.

5 Correct?

6 A. That's right.

7 Q. Okay. So you would have to rely
8 on the officer's memory if no notes were
9 provided that this is what occurred on these
10 dates?

11 A. If no notes were provided.

12 Q. Okay.

13 A. Typically people keep notes in a
14 notebook.

15 Q. Do they turn in the notebook when
16 then send an entire packet up to
17 headquarters?

18 A. No. Generally they're destroyed.

19 Q. Okay.

20 A. The notes are destroyed.

21 Q. It finally says on 3/6 there's
22 information received from Haven that they
23 don't know anything.

24 Correct?

25 A. Yes.

2 Q. So we have a report accepted on
3 2/23, okay, and two weeks later the trooper
4 finally has some information, which is no
5 information.

6 Right?

7 A. Right.

8 Q. And there's nothing in between,
9 any other source looked at, any neighborhood
10 canvases, any discussions with the district
11 attorney, any NCIC checks, any criminal
12 history checks, any other missing persons
13 data banks looked at, any automobile accident
14 reports, visits to the hospital, nothing like
15 that in between.

16 Right?

17 A. I see nothing like that
18 documented.

19 Q. No.

20 Okay. It indicates
21 though, however, on March 11, '06 Trooper
22 Smith finds some addresses.

23 Correct?

24 A. Yes, sir.

25 Q. There's no report that you could

1
2 identify to or have knowledge about, do you,
3 from Trooper Smith?

4 Is there?

5 You don't have any
6 knowledge of any from him.

7 Do you?

8 A. No. I don't know if there's an
9 attachment from him or not.

10 Q. Okay. And if there were
11 attachments it should be indicated as
12 probably other in the attachment box?

13 A. Yes.

14 Q. Okay. And this page not marked
15 off.

16 A. Well, do you mean if Trooper
17 Smith submitted something?

18 Q. Yes.

19 A. No. That block wouldn't be
20 checked. He would submit another report that
21 looks like this.

22 Q. Okay.

23 A. And the supplemental report box
24 would be checked.

25 Q. And if it existed it would have

2 been with the investigation file?

3 A. Yes.

4 Q. Which means it would have been
5 turned over to me because I asked for it?

6 A. Yes, sir.

7 Q. Okay. Now, that indicates on
8 3/11/06 Trooper Smith possibly comes up with
9 two addresses in Albuquerque, New Mexico and
10 Colorado. Romeo, Colorado.

11 Correct?

12 A. Yes.

13 Q. All right. Now, relying on your
14 training as a supervisor and expectations as
15 a supervisor of what you expect subordinates
16 to do in the State Police looking for
17 children believed as classified, concealed,
18 okay, how much time should pass from the time
19 that you at least know of a potential
20 location until the time you're going to act
21 with that information?

22 A. I wouldn't think very much time
23 at all should pass before you contact
24 someone.

25 Q. That day or the next?

1 STEVEN J. IGNATZ

2 A. Personally, if it was my case I
3 would probably do that.

4 Q. Yeah. And I'm not trying to get
5 you, personally.

6 A. Right.

7 Q. Because I don't want to put you
8 on the spot personally.

9 Based on your training and
10 experience as a trooper and a supervisor what
11 would be expected of a Pennsylvania State
12 Police of it's trooper who had information on
13 March 11, 2006 of the potential whereabouts
14 of the children being concealed?

15 A. I would think they would act upon
16 it very promptly. Within a few days.

17 Q. One? Two?

18 A. Something like that.

19 Q. I'm just trying to be fair.

20 If you think five days,
21 tell me five days.

22 A. I think promptly.

23 Q. Next entry, next page, May 26,
24 '06 is the entry.

25 Isn't it?

1

STEVEN J. IGNATZ

2 A. Yes, sir.

3 Q. And this report was prepared on
4 June 19, '06.

5 Correct?

6 A. Yes, sir.

7 Q. So the event occurring on May 26
8 and the date that the event was recorded on
9 the report appears to be almost three weeks.

10 Correct?

11 21-some days?

12 A. Yes, sir.

13 Q. Okay. Now, am I correct that
14 this entry shows that they have finally acted
15 on the March 11, '06 information?

16 So more than two months
17 has passed.

18 Correct?

19 A. That's what's documented.

20 Q. In conformity with the
21 Pennsylvania State Police requirements for
22 investigating this type of information is
23 that timely?

24 A. I don't think it's timely.

25 Q. Okay. I know you're saying you,

2 but I want to be sure as a supervisor of the
3 State Police. Not you, personally.

4 A. Yeah. We have requirements to do
5 supplemental reports at least every 60 days.
6 So if it falls outside of that. The
7 reporting requirements are 60 days.

8 Q. And this is over 60 days.
9 Isn't it?

10 A. Yes, sir.

11 Q. Okay. So there should be some
12 supervisory report from this trooper's
13 supervisor.

14 Correct?

15 A. Yeah. I don't know what was
16 going on on that end, but, yes. What
17 generally happens is a supervisor runs an
18 overdue report list and let's the
19 investigator know the report is filed.

20 Q. Let me ask you hypothetically.
21 If a report were overdue, to use your word,
22 okay, would the supervisor of the station
23 call the trooper in and say what's going on
24 or something to that effect?

25 A. Not the station commander